## Exhibit 26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division

-----:

SONY MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, et al.,:
Plaintiffs, :

-vs- : Case No. 1:18-cv-950

COX COMMUNICATIONS, INC., et al.,:

Defendants.:

----:

HEARING ON MOTIONS

January 25, 2019

Before: John F. Anderson, U.S. Mag. Judge

## APPEARANCES:

Matthew J. Oppenheim, Scott A. Zebrak, Jeffrey M. Gould, and Kerry M. Mustico, Counsel for the Plaintiffs

Thomas M. Buchanan, Jennifer A. Golinveaux, and Sean R. Anderson, Counsel for the Defendants

1

have asked for.

2.

THE COURT: Okay. So you have provided them with the notices. What other information have you provided to them that is responsive to their requests relating to MarkMonitor.

MR. OPPENHEIM: So on page 24, Your Honor, we describe -- we either have produced or are going to produce downloads of the unauthorized copies of the copyrighted works infringed by Cox's subscribers. Documents sufficient to --

MarkMonitor? I mean, MarkMonitor says these are the downloaded -- this is what our investigation has resulted in this work having been improperly downloaded. And then you are providing them with a copy of the downloaded work, right?

THE COURT: What does that have to do with

MR. OPPENHEIM: It's the evidence that MarkMonitor has captured for purposes of the case. It's great, they get to play all the music.

THE COURT: Okav.

MR. OPPENHEIM: Documents to show the information concerning the infringement of the copyrighted works in suit by their subscribers. Documents concerning the reliability of the MarkMonitor system. Documents relating to Cox's response to receiving infringement notices.

All right. So, we -- MarkMonitor would forward the notice. We would get responses back from Cox, we have those. And documents concerning the number of infringement notices

1

2.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

69

that Cox was taking. So, you know, if there are other search terms and categories, narrowed categories that they want to discuss, happy to have that ESI discussion, Your Honor. I really -- I come back to, I think this isn't the way to do this. We're trying our best. THE COURT: I don't see anything in here that talks about your agreement or relationship -- documents sufficient to describe your relationship with MarkMonitor. MR. OPPENHEIM: One moment, Your Honor. So, Your Honor, it's not listed, but we have agreed and I believe told them in the meet and confer, that the agreement concerning this program with MarkMonitor either has been or will be produced. Okay. So, Your Honor, we actually had a two-step process in our responding to their requests on MarkMonitor. We initially agreed to produce certain documents. We then met and conferred. We then provided a supplemental response and agreed in the supplemental response to provide the six categories here. So the agreement to provide the underlying agreement was in our initial response, not the supplemental response. More detailed than Your Honor probably wanted. THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Buchanan, what --

MR. BUCHANAN: Just briefly, Your Honor.

The

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
THE COURT: Well, on this one -- and again, I really
try not to do this very often, but I think this is another one
in which I think other than making it clear that I am requiring
a production of the documents that are sufficient to show the
relationship between MarkMonitor and each individual plaintiff.
          So again, I don't know -- you know, we have a number
of different plaintiffs here. And so, if there are individual
agreements with MarkMonitor or understandings.
          But, you know, there has to be some documents that
are sufficient to show the relationship, which would be I think
probably 156 is the one that -- the relationship agreements,
not all communications, but the relationships and agreements
between the plaintiff and MarkMonitor. So --
          MR. OPPENHEIM: I am sorry, can I ask -- I feel like
I am always getting --
          THE COURT: It's like your contractual obligation.
mean, if you signed a contract with them, if you have a written
agreement, if you have an understanding, you know, a letter
agreement that says you're going to do this, we will pay you
this, you provide me with these services, these are your
obligations, these are my obligations, that kind of agreement
or description of the relationship between MarkMonitor and your
clients.
          MR. OPPENHEIM: As it respect -- with respect --
          THE COURT: With respect to --
```

```
74
 1
               MR. OPPENHEIM: -- to the program at issue in this
 2.
     case.
 3
               THE COURT: -- the program at issue in this case,
 4
     right.
 5
               MR. OPPENHEIM: Very well, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: All right. The other issues I think are
 6
 7
     really at this point more of a moving target than something
 8
     that I can deal with. I mean, I think they are doing the
 9
     search. They again need to be transparent in what they are
10
     producing as far as the results of the search terms and what it
     is that they are and aren't producing as a result of those
11
12
     search terms.
13
               And if there is a need to, you know, I -- they have
14
     at least indicated in their opposition some of the search terms
15
     that they are having. I didn't hear that you have actually
     suggested anything more to them at this point in time. But you
16
17
     all are going to need to talk about that one some more before I
18
     do that.
19
               So other than the documents specifying, which I don't
20
     think are included in items 1 through 6 in the opposition on
21
     page 24, obviously they need to produce what they agreed to
22
     produce in this opposition, including the information that goes
23
     beyond the 2012-2014 range for the reliability or issues, plus
2.4
     the agreement and relationship. Okay?
25
               MR. BUCHANAN: The next component, Your Honor, is a
```

2. CERTIFICATE of TRANSCRIPTION I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript that was typed by me from the recording provided by the court. Any errors or omissions are due to the inability of the undersigned to hear or understand said recording. Further, that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the above-styled action, and that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the above-styled action. /s/ Norman B. Linnell Norman B. Linnell Court Reporter - USDC/EDVA